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***Introduction***

As part of the Community Consulting Project initiative at the UC Davis Graduate School of Management, our team was honored to work on this project with the UC Davis retail food providers. Our goal was to offer feedback and streamline processes in order to meet the requirements of the University of California Policy on Sustainable Practices. In doing so, we have been working with representatives throughout the UC Davis food system to research current sustainability efforts, as well as determine future growth opportunities to further increase sustainable food purchases.

***Project Mission***

This project supports the retail food providers at University of California, Davis in implementing the UC Sustainable Foods Policy. These retailers include franchise outlets, coffee shacks, catering services, sports stadiums and the Associated Students of UC Davis Coffee House. Given time constraints and wide scope of these retailers, our group chose to focus our efforts on the student-run Coffee House (CoHo).

***Background***

The University of California (UC) has a long history of leading research in numerous academic disciplines, including environmental science and agriculture. In recent years, UC has moved beyond research and made a commitment to minimize its impact on the environment and reduce its dependence on non-renewable energy. In 2003, UC adopted a Policy on Sustainable Practices that provided different ways to promote environmentally sustainable practices on UC campuses in areas such as green building design, transportation services, and waste management. In 2009, the policy was revised to include a section on sustainable foodservices.

The section in the policy on sustainable foodservice practices sets a goal of procuring 20% sustainable food products by the year 2020 for campus foodservice operations.  Campus foodservice providers include dining services, retail services (such as franchises like Taco Bell), and medical center foodservices. The policy outlines approximately 20 ways foods can be categorized as sustainable, though definitions are largely left for the campuses to interpret. The goal of the policy aims to not only provide student and staff patrons with sustainable food options but also access to educational materials to help customers learn about sustainable foods. The policy encourages dining operations to seek “green business” certifications such as “Green Seal’s Restaurants and Food Services Operations certification program” or the “Green Restaurant Association certification program.”  In order to achieve the 2020 goal, food service providers are instructed to track and report the percentage of total purchases that are sustainable.

While this may seem like a daunting task, one arm of the UC Davis food service operations – University Resident Dining Services – is well ahead of the pack in purchasing and providing sustainable foods to students and reporting its successes.  The University Resident Dining Services is operated by Sodexo, USA and includes four dining room facilities and three convenience stores.  During the academic year of 2008-2009, 21% of the food provided to students by Residential Dining Services was sustainable by UC standards.  In addition to purchasing more than 20% sustainable foods, Sodexo implements a number of sustainable practices in other areas, such as recycling, composting, and waste reduction.  By cutting costs in other areas, like removing trays from the dining halls, which decreased food waste by nearly one-half, Sodexo has been able to purchase higher priced sustainable foods.

The UC Davis retail food services — including the ASUCD Coffee House, the Silo (which houses Brenan’s Coffee, La Crepe, Sub City, Taco Bell, and Carl’s Jr.)Gunrock Pub and Café, coffee kiosks, concessions and catering — can learn from the successes of residential dining services. Sodexo operates all retail food services with the exception of the CoHo, which is operated by Associated Students. Because the retail food services do not have the same level of demand or consistent patronage as the residential dining services (which provide approximately 1.8 million meals per year to mostly freshman students), there are different challenges to meeting the policy requirements. For this reason, our group has focused on looking at the challenges and opportunities presented in meeting the expectations of the sustainable foodservices policy, with particular attention to the CoHo.

***Project Deliverables***

1. **Assess CoHo’s current food purchasing behavior as it relates to 2020 Sustainable Food policy**
   1. Examine CoHo’s 2009 invoices
   2. Breakdown purchases by item, servery, and vendor
   3. Analyze purchases and contribution to food cost
2. **Create range of possible changes that could make CoHo reach/surpass 2020 policy**
   1. Identify successful changes already implemented by Sodexho in residential dining services, concessions, and at the Silo
   2. Explore possible sourcing changes that would meet sustainability goals including disposable packaging
   3. Compare existing vendors’ prices of sustainable products
   4. Make recommendations that would minimize impact on food cost and subsequent prices to customers
3. **Establish user-friendly sustainability reporting tool for CoHo**
   1. Clarify reporting requirements of 2020 policy
   2. Apply these requirements to CoHo practices
   3. Create reporting template
4. **Develop marketing plan to raise campus-wide awareness of UCD sustainability successes to date and to promote CoHo’s reopening in fall 2010**
   1. Publicize sustainability goals already met on UCD campus and their impacts
   2. Increase awareness of CoHo’s identity and practices including independent, student-run, price competitiveness, and CoHome-made
5. **Determine best practices and lessons learned on UCD campus for replication on other UC campuses**
   1. Identify successful changes made on UCD campus
   2. Explore scalability of UCD solutions both of Sodexo and CoHo as well as residential versus retail food service

In order to meet and exceed expectations for this project, we formed a team that incorporated the backgrounds necessary to achieve success.  All five team members are current business school students at UC Davis with varying interests and experiences.  Below is a breakdown of each team member, including areas of expertise as well as previous experience that contributed successfully to our project.

* Eve Goldstein-Siegel
  + Previous project management experience working for an international research organization, as well as research and program development for fair trade organizations.
* Bory Kim
  + Work experience includes Property and Casualty Underwriting for Life Science Business, as well as statistics, accounting and marketing coursework.
* Scilla Outcault
  + Various small business management and consulting experience. Projects include business development, marketing and graphic design for the food industry.
* Emily Rancer
  + Journalism background and extensive marketing coursework with intentions of entering the healthy food industry.
* Kara Salzman
  + Marketing and promotions experience working for large food and beverage companies such as Hormel Foods, Coca Cola and Paramount Farms.

***Sustainability: Background and Definitions***

Sustainability means different things to different people. The American Public Health Association defines a sustainable food system as "one that provides healthy food to meet current food needs while maintaining healthy ecosystems that can also provide food for generations to come with minimal negative impact to the environment. A sustainable food system also encourages local production and distribution infrastructures and makes nutritious food available, accessible, and affordable to all. Further, it is humane and just, protecting farmers and other workers, consumers, and communities."[[1]](#footnote-1) When it comes to consumers in the US, they often define sustainability as “the ability to last over time” and the “ability to support oneself.”[[2]](#footnote-2) Even at UC Davis, there are different interpretations of what sustainable food means. Yet, most people would agree that moving towards a more sustainable food system will have positive environmental and social impacts on our communities and societies, and allow us to produce food with existing resources well into future generations.

Since a great deal of interpretation exists around the idea of sustainable foods, our team attempted to clarify what can and cannot be classified as a sustainable food purchase. We used the University of California Policy on Sustainable Practices to establish the criteria that should be met to classify a purchase as sustainable food. We then provided detailed definitions for each criterion. Thus, if a food purchase meets one or more of the criteria listed, it is classified as a sustainable food. The list of definitions can be found under *Tab 4*.

Additionally, to give food service providers and consumers a better idea of what sustainability criteria they should be looking for with different types of food purchases, we created the following table.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Sustainability Criteria by Food Category** | |
| **Baked Goods** | Fair Trade Certified (sugar & cocoa), Rainforest Alliance Certified (vanilla), USDA Organic |
| **Beverages** | Fair Trade Certified, Rainforest Alliance Certified, Shade Grown or Bird Friendly, USDA Organic |
| **Coffee** | Fair Trade Certified, Rainforest Alliance Certified, Shade Grown or Bird Friendly, USDA Organic |
| **Dairy** | AGA Grassfed, Certified Human Raised & Handled, Food Alliance Certified, Grass-finished/100% Grassfed, Locally Grown, Pasture Raised, Protected Harvest, USDA Organic |
| **Eggs** | AGA Grassfed, Cage-free, Certified Human Raised & Handled, Food Alliance Certified, Grass-finished/100% Grassfed, Locally Grown, Pasture Raised, USDA Organic |
| **Fish/Seafood** | Marine Stewardship Council, Seafood Watch Guide "Best Choices" or "Good Alternatives" |
| **Meat** | AGA Grassfed, Certified Human Raised & Handled, Food Alliance Certified, Grass-finished/100% Grassfed, Locally Grown, Pasture Raised, USDA Organic |
| **Poultry** | AGA Grassfed, Cage-free, Certified Human Raised & Handled, Food Alliance Certified, Grass-finished/100% Grassfed, Locally Grown, Pasture Raised, USDA Organic |
| **Produce** | Fair Trade Certified, Food Alliance Certified, Locally Grown, Protected Harvest Certified, Rainforest Alliance Certified, USDA Organic |
| **Staples** | Fair Trade Certified (rice, sugar, cocoa), Food Alliance Certified, Locally Grown, Rainforest Alliance Certified (vanilla), USDA Organic |
| **Tea** | Fair Trade Certified, Rainforest Alliance Certified, USDA Organic |

For items that have multiple ingredients, such as baked goods, we determined that 95% of the ingredients should meet one or more sustainable criteria for that product to be classified as sustainable. This is in accordance with the USDA National Organic Program’s standards for organic certification. Take a blueberry muffin as an example. If the flour, sugar, salt, baking soda, eggs are all USDA organic, but the blueberries are not, it would not qualify as sustainable since the blueberries make up more than 5% of the ingredients to this product. On the other hand, if all ingredients except baking soda were USDA organic, this product would be classified as a sustainable food. Alternatively, if the muffin were conventionally made (meaning, for example, that no organic or Fair Trade ingredients were used) at a local business that is a cooperative or has profit sharing with all of its employees, then it would also be considered a sustainable food product.

Please note that while all food purchases have the possibility of meeting the “farm/business is a cooperative or has profit sharing” or the “farm/business has a social responsibility policy,” these features are quite uncommon with traditional food vendors, such as US Food Service and Sysco. It is more likely that these criteria will apply to local farmers and local businesses. We have found that it is easiest to determine whether or not food is sustainable when the food service provider personally knows their vendors and how the vendors/farmers/processors make or acquire their products.

By clarifying and further defining what the sustainable food criteria mean, we aimed to create consistency among the different food service providers and universities in how they define sustainable food. At the same time, we understand that as the sustainable and “green” movements evolve, so do the meanings of what it is to be sustainable. For this reason, we have come up with some suggestions for future iterations of the sustainable food policy found in the recommendations section below.

***Analysis of CoHo Food Purchases***

Two methods were used to analyze the food purchases at the CoHo: *The Real Food Calculator* and *The CoHo* Calculator. We chose to use these two methods because of the variability in interpretations of sustainable food. While the newly created *CoHo Calculator* has a specific set of criteria to define sustainable food purchases, not all college campuses will follow or even interpret the criteria in the same way. Therefore, because the *Real Food Calculator* is used at UC Davis and other college campuses, we chose to use both methods, and then compare our results.

Based on the food purchases at the CoHo and the sustainability criteria, we created a custom-tailored spreadsheet, *The CoHo Calculator*, which calculates the percentage of sustainable food purchased.  In addition to the criteria listed in the UC Policy, we added a few more criteria in anticipation of future changes. For example, “locally grown” is broken down into produced within 50 miles, 100 miles, and 250 miles. The spreadsheet allows the user to calculate the total percentage of sustainable food purchased as well as the percent of food purchases within one particular criterion**.** See *Tab 7* for our custom-tailored *CoHo Calculator* and *Tab 8* for the Reporting Template.

The *Real Food Calculator* is a tool developed for the *Real Food Challenge*, which is co-sponsored by the Food Project and California Student Sustainability Coalition. The *Real Food Challenge* began in 2007 as a student-initiated national campaign to raise awareness and advocate for “real food” on college campuses. The *Real Food Challenge* defines real food as food that is “ethically produced, with fair treatment of workers, equitable relationships with farmers (locally and abroad), and humanely treated animals [and] environmentally sustainable, grown without chemical pesticides, large-scale mono-cropping, or huge carbon footprints.”[[3]](#footnote-3)

For practical purposes, the *Real Food Calculator* (RFC) breaks real food into four categories: local/community based, fair, ecologically sound, and humane. To use the RFC, first obtain total annual food purchases and divide them into the 10food categories: baked goods, poultry, meat, tea, coffee, produce, fish/seafood, eggs, diary, and top 25 staples. Most vendors should be able to provide a list of purchase orders. Second, find out how and who produced the food purchased in order to determine if the purchase can be counted as “real food.” Once you have all of your purchases broken out for each food category and for each “real food,” enter the totals in the RFC worksheet and the spreadsheet will automatically fill in the percentages and generate tables and graphs. *See Tab 6* for a guide to using the *Real Food Calculator* and *Tab 8* for the Reporting Template.

While there is a great deal of overlap between the RFC and CoHo Calculator methods, there are also some key differences. One of the major distinctions is that the RFC does not take into account total purchases. Under the “staples” food category, it only considers the purchases from the top 25. Also, while the RFC breaks out coffee and tea as food categories, other beverage purchases should be counted under the “staples” food category.  However, to be consistent with the University Dining Services RFC, we did not include bottled water or soda because these beverage purchases are high-margin items, which skew the measurement of the staples category.  The CoHo calculator looks at total purchases, including all beverages. We can see how this changes the results, as the total food purchases for the CoHo during 2008-2009 according to the RFC is $1,171,523, as opposed to $1,456,290 calculated by *The CoHo Calculator*.

On the other hand, the RFC is easier to use, as it only breaks down sustainable foods into four main categories, whereas *The CoHo Calculator* has more than20categories. Although the RFC was used by the University Dining Services in its December 2009 report, it does not provide the detail of sustainable foods that *The CoHo Calculator* does.

Based on the results of *The CoHo Calculator*, the CoHo’s sustainable food purchases for the academic year 2008-2009 was 16%.  However, according to the RFC, the CoHo is already meeting the goal of the UC Policy at exactly 20% real food purchases.

These results are quite promising and illustrate that the CoHo has a strong commitment towards providing sustainable food options to its customers.  Yet, when we look at the breakdown of purchases by food category, we find that many of the qualifying foods purchased are still conventionally made, but are purchased locally.  In Graph 1, we see that the coffee, tea, and baked goods are where most of the actual sustainable food purchases occur.

From Graph 1 below, we see that only 2% of staple purchases (tofu) count as real food *(A)*.The food purchases that qualified as real food under the staple category include local rice from Rue &Foresman as well as local and organic tofu from Sacramento Tofu.

Additionally, purchasing Honest Tea, which counts as both Fair Trade and organic, contributes to 71% the CoHo’s current tea purchases. Also from the graph, 92% of baked goods purchased and 100% of coffee sold at the CoHo count as real food(B). Baked goods, such as bagels, croissants, and sliced bread, offered at the CoHo are all produced at bakeries in Davis or Sacramento. By buying these products at local businesses, the CoHo helps sustain the local economy and reduces the carbon footprint by cutting down on gas used for the baked goods to reach their end-users. And, since 2006, dining services has been serving Fair Trade coffee in every resident dining room, retail dining facility, and catering operations.  Since coffee is in such high demand and makes up a significant portion of total food and beverages purchases, it is a major contributor to meeting UC Policy goals.

**Graph 1**



With a commitment to offering freshly made and healthy food options to students and staff, it is not surprising that the CoHo has 20% sustainable food purchases.  Yet, there are still several areas in which the CoHo can improve.

Looking at Graph 2, below, we see that produce (18%) and dairy (16%) together make up nearly one third of all purchases.  By setting a goal to make 10% of produce and dairy purchases sustainable, the CoHo can easily exceed 20% sustainable purchases.  Similarly, meat, poultry and eggs are 20% of purchases.  Moving towards sustainable meat and poultry purchasing is costly, but there are some alternatives available to UC Davis food service providers.  By partnering with the meat lab on campus, food service providers would be able to purchase local, humanely raised meat at reasonable prices.

**Graph 2**



The CoHo is currently in a good position to meet the UC Policy goals by 2020. In fact, it is likely that the CoHo will meet these goals within the next year. Because the CoHo has a strategy that is committed to providing customers with a variety of real food options, it has the potential to achieve much more than is slated in the UC Policy on Sustainable Practices.

***Recommendations***

As our group researched ways to make the food offerings at the Coffee House and UC Davis food retail establishments more sustainable, we observed several easy steps other campuses can take to do the same. These recommendations generally fall into four categories: definitions, purchases, relationships and marketing.

***Definitions***

Determining how to minimize conventional foods and replace them with more sustainable substitutes can be challenging, especially if you believe your profits may decrease as a result. Before you can figure out how to purchase sustainably, however, you must first identify what “sustainable” means to your campus. This is one of the biggest challenges we and many other food organizations face, as there is no standardized set of definitions to follow. Our group has compiled a list of definitions based on the UC Policy, which can be found in *Tab 4*.Several organizations are largely basing their purchases off of the *Real Food Calculator*, as it is the most standardized tool available today and is a good match with the UC Policy’s criteria.

1. In an effort to promote local agricultural systems and community development, the committee responsible for the UC Policy should consider expanding the definition of “locally grown” to also include “locally processed” foods. For example, in our attempts to tally the CoHo's sustainable food purchases, we ran into some gray areas with the bakeries it sources from. The bakeries processed all their baked goods locally, but the ingredients themselves were sourced from different parts of the country. If the sustainability policy is meant to encourage local economic growth and support, locally processed foods should be included in the UC Policy as well.
2. The current definition for locally grown is food items produced within 500 miles of final consumption. We recommend defining locally grown as falling within one of three geographical tiers - Tier 1: 50 miles, Tier 2: 100 miles, Tier 3: 250 miles. An alternative definition for locally grown could be produced within the county or adjacent counties of final consumption.
3. The criteria on Seafood Watch Guide should only include “Best Practices.”
4. In thinking about meeting the triple bottom line – socially, environmentally and economically sustainable – we recommend that sustainable food be defined as meeting at least one environmental criterion and one social criterion. Many of the current criteria already encompass both the social and environmental aspect, such as Rainforest Alliance Certified. However, under the current definition, a company such as Chiquita, with a long history of worker rights’ abuses, can produce USDA organic bananas and qualify as “sustainable.”

***Purchases***

Once these criteria and definitions have been established, purchases can be modified to incorporate more sustainable foods. Our group has come up with a list of some of the most common sustainability criteria that various food categories can match up with, which can be found in *Tab 5*. In addition to using this helpful table, there are several ways to accomplish greater sustainable food purchases without damaging the bottom line:

* One of easiest ways to increase sustainable food purchases is through beverages, particularly coffee and tea (Fair Trade and/or organic).
* Buying food locally is a huge asset that California universities have practically in their backyards. Many define local as being within 250 miles, which means most UC campuses can count the Central Valley as “local.” Moreover, university food retailers can often buy baked goods and other regional specialties locally rather than through a distributor. This would not only help meet the 2020 goal, but it allows consumers to feel a connection with the local community.
* Even if universities are not located in an agriculturally rich area, food retailers can tap into the universities themselves; many have student-run food production facilities on campus. For example, UC Davis produces its own olive oil, meats, and, within the next year, ice cream. These not only count as local, but it’s a way to support the very university in which you operate.
* We recommend that a food retailer approach sustainable purchasing decisions from the menu, rather than from the purchasing sheet. It can be easy to get caught up in how much of a certain item you buy in bulk, but we encourage retailers to start with the menu first: If you start making your egg salad sandwiches with cage-free eggs, how will that impact both the price of that sandwich, and your consumer’s desire (or indifference) toward the more sustainable product? What will the profit margins be and how sensitive will the consumer be to any price increases?

***Relationships***

Forming relationships with suppliers is key in not only getting better access to ingredients and prices, but also in determining where exactly the food comes from.

* If you know the food growers, distributors, processors, etc., you can have more of an understanding as to whether that food is sustainably farmed, processed, local etc. based on what you know of the organization.
* Forming a relationship allows you to also understand if there are circumstances about the supplier that can influence your decision to label something sustainable or not. For example, we found a rice farmer whose entire farming and production process was technically organic, but the farmer couldn’t afford the costs of getting it USDA certified. Depending on how flexible you consider your definitions, you may consider this supplier’s rice sustainable.
* While it may be easy to source from one big vendor, such as US Foods or Sysco, there may be enormous benefits in working with smaller suppliers in addition to that larger supplier when it comes to reaching a sustainability goal. It can be easier to pinpoint sustainable foods if you know your supplier well, and you can also access far more foods in the “local” category by looking to smaller suppliers.
* If you do use a large food distributor, see if you can get introductions to some of their main suppliers and get clear permission to communicate with them. This can often make your sustainability assessment more accurate.
* By having a good relationship with your main distributor, you may also be able to get them to do some of the legwork for you in terms of identifying sustainable purchases.

***Marketing***

Regardless of how incredible a food retailer’s sustainable offerings are, sales will likely suffer unless students are excited about them. After all, if the students aren’t aware of what sustainable foods are on the menu, why they’re on the menu, and how it affects them personally, they won’t purchase them. Moreover, if the price increases on those items over time, those students will be even less likely to purchase them in the future. Our group has devised several ways a campus retailer can get students to not only be interested in sustainable foods, but purchase them as well.

* Provide clear signage around your retail establishment. This includes table tents (a very simple, inexpensive yet effective tool), menus that detail what is sustainable, signs around coffee and displayed baked goods indicating if they are sustainable in any way. Make sure, however, that you’re not just smacking “organic” and “Fair Trade” labels on items without telling consumers what “organic” and “Fair Trade” mean from a consumer standpoint. Many students have no idea.
* Offer coupons and discounts to freshmen in their orientation packet and/or during orientation week.
* Offer coupons and discounts on some of your bigger sustainable offerings, such as Fair Trade Friday, where anything you offer that is Fair Trade is sold at, say, a 10% discount. This can generate interest in sustainable foods and provides the food retailer with a channel for informing students about them.
* Consider using Facebook to promote your retail food establishment; this is a great way to offer sporadic discounts or and promote special events
* Partner with groups, clubs and departments on campus whose goals are aligned with your own. For example, team up with the university’s art program and have students provide artwork with a sustainable food theme for your establishment. Or work with the students in the agricultural program for seasonal purchases and joint marketing efforts.

***Conclusion***

The UC Davis food service operations have made tremendous strides towards providing sustainable foods to students, staff, and faculty.  University Residential Dining has already met the 2020 goal of 20% sustainable food purchases and the Coffee House is nearly there. Results from this project show that UC Davis already has the right systems and management in place to provide more sustainable foods to its clients. Moreover, UC Davis continually strives for even better ways to provide its services in environmentally sound and ethically-based ways. These commitments have placed the university’s food establishments – particularly the CoHo – in a strong position to be national leaders in the sustainable food movement.

Sustainability of UC Davis Food Retailers

Sustainability Report – June 2010

# Introduction

The Coffeehouse in the Memorial Union is owned and operated by Associated Students, and has a long tradition of from-scratch cooking and student leadership. Meals offered at the CoHo consist of the following food stations: Bakery/Coffee/Espresso, Pizza/Pasta, Deli/Bagel, Burrito/Grill, Soup/Salad, and Comfort Foods. The current food Service Director has served for over 25 years and is dedicated to from-scratch, healthy, and inexpensive food. The Coffeehouse is popular with students and faculty alike but is operating on a reduced basis during a major renovation. It will re-open at full capacity in fall, 2010.

# Real Food Calculator (RFC)

The Real Food Calculator (RFC) was developed by the Real Food Challenge organization and it is a tool to track institutional food purchasing. Co-sponsored by the Food Project and California Student Sustainability Coalition, the Real Food Challenge began in 2007 as a national campaign to raise awareness among college students and for students to advocate for “Real Food” on college campuses.

For more information on the Real Food Calculator, go to <http://realfoodchallenge.org/calculator>.

# Summary of the RFC for CoHo

Sustainability Result

ASUCD Coffee House already meets the 2020 Sustainable Foods purchasing goal of 20% “Real Food”. Including but not limited to the following:

* Fair trade certified coffee
* Locally produced within 250 miles
* Purchasing Fair Trade coffee
* Purchasing Baked goods from local Davis bakeries
* Supporting local business within Davis area, like Sacramento Tofu

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Real v. Conventional?** | **Total Purchases** | **% of Total** |
| Conventional | $936,433 | 80% |
| Real Food | $235,090 | 20% |

Total Purchases by Category

All purchases of Meat, Poultry, Dairy, Eggs, Fish/Seafood and Produce were conventional.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Total $ Spent** | **Category** | **Conventional** | **Real Food (B)** | **Real Food (A)** |
| $124,190 | *Baked Goods* | 8% | 92% | 0% |
| $127,358 | *Meat* | 100% | 0% | 0% |
| $78,250 | *Poultry* | 100% | 0% | 0% |
| $193,724 | *Dairy* | 100% | 0% | 0% |
| $26,754 | *Eggs* | 100% | 0% | 0% |
| $14,410 | *Fish/Seafood* | 100% | 0% | 0% |
| $85,393 | *Coffee* | 0% | 100% | 0% |
| $29,861 | *Tea* | 29% | 71% | 0% |
| $211,993 | *Produce* | 100% | 0% | 0% |
| $279,590 | *Staples (top 25)* | 95% | 3% | 2% |
| $1,171,523 | *TOTAL* | 80% | 20% | 0% |

Top 25 Staple Purchases\*

These food items did not fall under the 10 RFC food categories. They were all ranked and only the top 25 items were included in the RFC calculation.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Product Description** | **Total Dollars** |
| Odwalla Juice | $100,985.00 |
| BROTH, LMN GRASS REF SOUP 4:1 | $25,966.02 |
| SAUCE, GRN CURRY REF | $21,608.85 |
| BEAN, REFRD VGTRN WHL DRY | $12,273.95 |
| NOODLE, RICE STICK MED IMP | $11,211.08 |
| BREADSTICK, FRNCH 7" PARBK FZN | $10,897.28 |
| FLOUR, BKR HRVST KING MLTD AP | $9,126.62 |
| Rice | $8,998.00 |
| MILK SUB, SOY VNL CTN SHLF | $8,994.82 |
| FLOUR, PSTY CMEO ENRHD | $6,494.00 |
| CHIP, TORTLA CORN WHT TRGLE | $6,372.36 |
| SOUP, VEG NDL REF BROTH | $5,956.06 |
| Soft Tofu | $5,225.00 |
| TOMATO, SCE POUCH | $5,047.74 |
| CHOCOLATE, CHIP SEMI SWT 1K | $4,805.19 |
| HONEY, WFLWR GRD A PLST JUG | $4,285.42 |
| OIL, CNOLA TFF SALAD | $4,280.56 |
| SUGAR, BRN BEET | $4,148.65 |
| SUGAR, WHT GRAN CANE | $3,877.64 |
| OIL, OLIV CNOLA EX VRGN 75/25 | $3,874.12 |
| DOUGH, RL CIN GRMT LOG FZN | $3,114.15 |
| RICE, LONG GRAIN PARBOILED | $3,072.33 |
| BACON, PORK TPNG PC .5" APLWD | $3,008.12 |
| BEEF SUB, PTY MEATL BURGR | $2,991.38 |
| SAUCE, SOY | $2,975.87 |
| **TOTAL** | **$279,590.21** |

\*Does not include bottled water or carbonated beverages from Coke or Pepsi.

# Next Steps

Although we have already met the 20% sustainability goal, the ASUCD Coffeehouse is committed to continually improving its sustainability practices. To continue our sustainability efforts, we will explore sustainable substitutes in the following areas:

* Flour and other baking supplies
* Regional specialties including nuts, olive oil, honey
* Condiments
* Beans

Sustainability of UC Davis Food Retailers

Sustainability Report – June 2010

# Introduction

The Coffeehouse in the Memorial Union is owned and operated by Associated Students, and has a long tradition of from-scratch cooking and student leadership. The current food Service Director has served for over 25 years and is dedicated to from-scratch, healthy, and inexpensive food. The Coffeehouse is popular with students and faculty alike but is operating on a reduced basis during a major renovation. It will re-open at full capacity in fall, 2010.

# Implementation of Sustainability Policy

The overall goal is to reduce the environmental impact of food purchases and dining operations while maintaining accessibility and affordability for all students, the University has set a goal of procuring 20% sustainable food products by the year 2020 for Campus Foodservice Operations.

# Purchases

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| All Sustainable Purchases | $ 253,694.24 |
| Total Food Purchases | $ 1,456,289.66 |
|  |  |
| Percentage sustainable | 17.421% |

The ASUCD Coffeehouse (CoHo) purchased $ 1,456,289.66 worth of food from July 2008 through June 2009. This amount does not include non-food items including disposables, equipment and kitchen supplies. Of these food purchases, $253,694.24 was spent on sustainable purchases. Thus, 17.4% of food purchases were sustainable. Our standards for sustainability are defined in the following section. While some of our purchases qualify for more than one sustainability category, we only counted the purchase once in calculating sustainable purchase percentage.

# Sustainability Standards

According to the 2009 University of California Policy on Sustainable Practices, “sustainable food is defined as food purchases that meet one or more of the following criteria.” To better organize these criteria, we have numbered them.

*Sustainability Codes*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **#** | **Name** |
| 1 | Locally Grown - 50 miles |
| 2 | Locally Grown - 100 miles |
| 3 | Locally Grown - 250 miles |
| 4 | Fair Trade Certified |
| 5 | Domestic Fair Trade Certified |
| 6 | Shade-Grown or Bird Friendly Coffee |
| 7 | Rainforest Alliance Certified |
| 8 | Food Alliance Certified |
| 9 | USDA Organic |
| 10 | OG 1: 100% Organic |
| 11 | OG 2: At least 95% organic |
| 12 | OG 3: At least 70% organic |
| 13 | AGA Grassfed |
| 14 | Pasture Raised |
| 15 | Grass-finished/100% Grassfed |
| 16 | Certified Humane Raised & Handled |
| 17 | Cage-free |
| 18 | Protected Harvest Certified |
| 19 | Marine Stewardship Council |
| 20 | Seafood Watch Guide |
| 21 | Farm cooperative |
| 22 | Farm profit sharing |
| 23 | Farm social responsibility policy |
| 24 | Other certified processes |

# Sustainability Definitions

We have developed definitions for each of these criteria. Where applicable, these definitions have been derived from relevant governing bodies. Other definitions have been supplemented with outside information. Definitions will likely be updated in the future as the sustainability policy and its interpretation changes.

# Our Purchases

At present, some of the sustainability criteria apply to our purchases while others do not. Therefore, we have detailed the categories relevant to our current purchases. It is important to note that the purchases below may appear in multiple categories. However, purchases were only counted once when calculating the over sustainability percentage.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Locally Grown | 8.5% of total food purchases |
| Defined as food that is produced within 500 miles of final consumption destination. Locally processed foods are not currently included in this definition. | |
| 1: Locally Grown - 50 Miles | * Pure Grain (Sliced bread, croissants, baguettes) Local producer, gets flour, seeds, and grains from Woodland (certified Organic), eggs and honey from Vacaville * Rue & Foresman Rice (Rice) * Lundberg Farms (Rice Snacks) |
| 3: Locally Grown - 250 Miles | * Main Street Bagels (Bagels) Local producer, 95% of ingredients local, flour from Fresno |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Fair Trade Certified <http://www.transfairusa.org> | 5.85% of total food purchases |
| Food must be certified by TransFair USA, the third party certifier for coffee, tea and herbs, cocoa and chocolate, fresh fruit, sugar, rice, vanilla, flowers, and honey. Fair Trade Certified means that prices, working conditions and wages meet a strict set of standards that ensure farmers and farm workers in developing countries receive a fair price for their product. Food bearing the fair trade label must be grown by small-scale producers who are democratically organized, have fair labor conditions including freedom of association, safe working conditions and living wages (child labor is strictly prohibited). Also, the Fair Trade certification system strictly prohibits the use of genetically modified organisms (GMO’s), promotes integrated farm management systems that improve soil fertility, and limits the use of harmful agrochemicals in favor of environmentally sustainable farming methods. | |
| 4: Fair Trade Certified | * Bean Trees Coffee |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Shade Grown & Bird-Friendly Certification[nationalzoo.si.edu/SCBI/MigratoryBirds/Coffee/criteria.cfm](http://nationalzoo.si.edu/SCBI/MigratoryBirds/Coffee/criteria.cfm) | 5.85% of total food purchases |
| Defined as coffee certified by the Smithsonian Migratory Bird Center (SMBC) as100%-organic-shade-grown-coffee. The “Bird Friendly®” seal refers to the structure of the tree shade on the coffee plantation or farm. To qualify for Bird Friendly certification, the farms or plantations must meet one of the following tree structures: (1) diverse commercial polyculture; (2) traditional polyculture; or (3) rustic system. | |
| 6: Shade-Grown or Bird Friendly Coffee | * Bean Trees Coffee |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| USDA Organic [www.ams.usda.gov/AMSv1.0/nop](http://www.ams.usda.gov/AMSv1.0/nop) | 7.84% of total food purchases |
| The United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) houses the National Organic Program (NOP) that develops, implements, and administers national production, handling, and labeling standards. USDA Organic means that at least 95% of ingredients of a product are organic. To be certified organic, products must meet all USDA standards for crops, livestock and handling. | |
| 9: USDA Organic | * Bean Trees Coffee * Honest Tea * Assorted teas and juices by Guayaki * Oregon Chai products * Lundberg Farms (Rice snacks) |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Organic | 1.08% of total food purchases |
| United Natural Foods (UNFI) describes products with varying levels of organic products in the following categories: OG1 to OG3. We have used these designations across non-UNFI products as well. | |
| 10: OG 1 - 100% Organic | * Guisto’s (Whole Wheat Pastry Flour) * Sacramento Tofu (Tofu) Tofu is made from organic ingredients but processing has not been certified organic. |
| 11: OG 2 - At least 95% Organic | * Vegenaise from Follow your Health * Candy by St. Claire’s * Assorted candy by Sunspire |
| 12: OG 3 – At Least 70% Organic | * Assorted juice flavors by Odwalla |

# Next Steps

Currently at 17.4% we still need to make some purchasing changes in order reach the 20% sustainability goal. To reach this goal we will explore sustainable substitutes in the following areas:

* Flour and other baking supplies
* Regional specialties including nuts, olive oil, honey
* Condiments
* Beans

*Sustainability Definitions*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Locally Grown |  |
| Defined as food that is produced within 500 miles of final consumption destination. Locally processed foods are not currently included in this definition. | |
| 1: Locally Grown - 50 Miles |  |
| 2: Locally Grown - 100 Miles |  |
| 3: Locally Grown - 250 Miles |  |
| Fair Trade Certified | <http://www.transfairusa.org> |
| Food must be certified by TransFair USA, the third party certifier for coffee, tea and herbs, cocoa and chocolate, fresh fruit, sugar, rice, vanilla, flowers, and honey. Fair Trade Certified means that prices, working conditions and wages meet a strict set of standards that ensure farmers and farm workers in developing countries receive a fair price for their product. Food bearing the fair trade label must be grown by small-scale producers who are democratically organized, have fair labor conditions including freedom of association, safe working conditions and living wages (child labor is strictly prohibited). Also, the Fair Trade certification system strictly prohibits the use of genetically modified organisms (GMO’s), promotes integrated farm management systems that improve soil fertility, and limits the use of harmful agrochemicals in favor of environmentally sustainable farming methods. | |
| 4: Fair Trade Certified |  |
| Domestic Fair Trade Certified | [www.dftassociation.org](http://www.dftassociation.org) |
| Domestic Fair Trade is defined as food products produced by small-scale family farms and farmer co-operatives who value and abide by the following principles: family scale farming, capacity building for producers and workers, democratic and participatory ownership and control, rights of labor, equality and opportunity, direct trade, fair and stable pricing, shared risk and affordable credit, long-term trade relationships, sustainable agriculture, appropriate technology, indigenous peoples’ rights, transparency and accountability, and education & advocacy. | |
| 5: Domestic Fair Trade Certified |  |
| Shade Grown & Bird-Friendly Certification | [nationalzoo.si.edu/SCBI/MigratoryBirds/Coffee/criteria.cfm](http://nationalzoo.si.edu/SCBI/MigratoryBirds/Coffee/criteria.cfm) |
| Defined as coffee certified by the Smithsonian Migratory Bird Center (SMBC) as100%-organic-shade-grown-coffee. The “Bird Friendly®” seal refers to the structure of the tree shade on the coffee plantation or farm. To qualify for Bird Friendly certification, the farms or plantations must meet one of the following tree structures: (1) diverse commercial polyculture; (2) traditional polyculture; or (3) rustic system. | |
| 6: Shade-Grown or Bird Friendly Coffee |  |
| Rainforest Alliance Certified | [www.rainforestalliance.org](http://www.rainforestalliance.org) |
| A product that is Rainforest Alliance Certified must meet the standards set by the Sustainable Agriculture Network (SAN). Food that is Rainforest Alliance Certified means: less water pollution, less soil erosion, reduced threats to the environment and human health, wildlife habitat is protected, less waste as farmers use farm by-products for composting, less water used, more efficient farm management, improved conditions for farm workers, improved profitability and competitiveness for farmers, and more collaboration between farmers and conservationists. | |
| 7: Rainforest Alliance Certified |  |
| Food Alliance Certified | [www.foodalliance.org](http://www.foodalliance.org) |
| Defined as farms, ranches and food handlers that are certified by the Food Alliance for sustainable agricultural and facility management practices. Farm and ranch standards include: providing safe and fair working conditions; ensuring the health and humane treatment of animals; no use of hormones or non-therapeutic antibiotics; no genetically modified crops or livestock; reducing pesticide use and toxicity; protecting soil and water quality; protecting and enhancing wildlife habitat; and continuously improving management practices. Food handler standards include: using Food Alliance Certified ingredients; providing safe and fair working conditions; conserving energy and water; reducing use of toxic and hazardous materials; ensuring quality control and food handling safety; no artificial flavors, colors or preservatives; continuously improving practices. | |
| 8: Food Alliance Certified |  |
| USDA Organic | [www.ams.usda.gov/AMSv1.0/nop](http://www.ams.usda.gov/AMSv1.0/nop) |
| The United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) houses the National Organic Program (NOP) that develops, implements, and administers national production, handling, and labeling standards. USDA Organic means that at least 95% of ingredients of a product are organic. To be certified organic, products must meet all USDA standards for crops, livestock and handling. | |
| 9: USDA Organic |  |
| Organic |  |
| United Natural Foods (UNFI) describes products with varying levels of organic products in the following categories: OG1 to OG3. We have used these designations across non-UNFI products as well. | |
| 10: OG 1 - 100% Organic |  |
| 11: OG 2 - At least 95% Organic |  |
| 12: OG 3 – At least 70% Organic |  |
| AGA Grassfed | [www.americangrassfed.org](http://www.americangrassfed.org) |
| The American Grassfed Association (AGA) defines grassfed products from ruminants, including cattle, bison, goats and sheep, as those food products from animals that have eaten nothing but their mother’s milk and fresh grass or grass-type hay from birth to harvest – all their lives. The AGA standards are intended to incorporate the attributes of open pasture, humane animal care, no antibiotics, no hormones, the production of nutritious and healthy meats and to be supportive of American family farms. | |
| 13: AGA Grassfed |  |
| Pasture Raised |  |
| This claim indicates the animal was raised outdoors on a pasture, and implies that it ate primarily grasses and other naturally occurring foods commonly found in pastures. | |
| 14: Pasture Raised |  |
| Grass-finished/ 100% Grassfed |  |
| As defined by the USDA, 100% Grassfed means that the ruminant animal (cattle, bison, goats and sheep) will have a diet of only grass and forage. Animals cannot be fed grain or grain byproducts and must have continuous access to pasture during the growing season. Grass-finished means that, during the fattening period which is typically the last few months before processing, animals are fed only grass (and not grain). | |
| 15: Grass-finished/100% Grassfed |  |
| Certified Humane Raised & Handled | [www.certifiedhumane.com](http://www.certifiedhumane.com) |
| Defined as a product certified through the consumer certification and labeling program run by the Humane Farm Animal Care organization. Animal care standards require that animals have ample space, shelter and gentle handling to limit stress. Additional requirements for certification are: use of growth hormones and antibiotics is prohibited; animals must be free to move and not be confined; livestock have access to sufficient, clean and nutritious feed and water; protection from weather elements, and an environment that promotes well being. Producers also must comply with local, state and federal environmental standards. Managers and caretakers must be thoroughly trained, skilled and competent in animal husbandry and welfare. | |
| 16: Certified Humane Raised & Handled |  |
| Cage-free |  |
| This is a first party claim that poultry (hens) are raised without cages. | |
| 17: Cage-free |  |
| Protected Harvest Certified | [www.protectedharvest.org](http://www.protectedharvest.org) |
| Defined as a product that is certified sustainable by Protected Harvest, a non‐profit organization that independently certifies farmers for ecologically based practices. There are nine different management categories on which certification is based: field scouting, information sources, pest management decisions, field management decisions, weed management, insect management, disease management, soil and water quality, and storage management. In order to qualify for certification, growers must stay below an established total number of “Toxicity Units” per acre and avoid use of certain high‐risk pesticides. Additionally, each packer or handler of the crop must undergo a chain-of-custody handler audit that follows the crop from field to retail. | |
| 18: Protected Harvest Certified |  |
| Marine Stewardship Council | [www.msc.org](http://www.msc.org) |
| The Marine Stewardship Council (MSC) certified sustainable seafood ensures sustainable fishing and seafood traceability. MSC standards have three overarching principles that every fishery must prove that it meets in order to be certified: 1) Sustainable fish stocks - fishing activity must be at a level which is sustainable for the fish population; 2) Minimizing environmental impact – fishing operations should be managed to maintain the structure, productivity, function and diversity of the ecosystem on which the fishery depends; and 3) Effective management – fishery must meet all local, national and international laws and must have a management system in place to respond to changing circumstances and maintain sustainability. | |
| 19: Marine Stewardship Council |  |
| Seafood Watch Guide | [www.montereybayaquarium.org/cr/cr\_seafoodwatch](http://www.montereybayaquarium.org/cr/cr_seafoodwatch) |
| Defined as seafood that is in either the “best choices” or “good alternatives” of Monterey Bay Aquarium’s Seafood Watch Guide. A seafood rating of “Best Choices” means that the seafood is abundant, well managed and caught or farmed in environmentally friendly ways. A seafood rating of “Good Alternatives” means that there are concerns with how the seafood is caught or farmed and concerns with the health of the habitat due to other human impacts. | |
| 20: Seafood Watch Guide |  |
| Farm/business is a cooperative | [www.ncfc.org](http://www.ncfc.org) |
| A cooperative is defined by the following criteria: (1) farm or business is member-owned and operated, (2) is incorporated under state law, and (3) cooperatives return earnings to their farmer members on a patronage basis. | |
| 21: Farm Cooperative |  |
| Farm/business has employee profit sharing |  |
| Profit sharing with all its employees means that the business or farm from which food is purchased has a plan in which every employee in the company receives a percentage of the farm’s or company’s profits. | |
| 22: Farm profit sharing |  |
| Farm/business has social responsibility policy |  |
| The farm or business from which food is purchased has policies that ensure employees can be part of a union or earn at least minimum wage, provide transportation and/or housing benefits, and health care benefits. | |
| 23: Farm social responsibility |  |
| Other Certified Processes |  |
| 24: Other certified processes |  |
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